

## The Sentinel.

TUESDAY, MAY 19.

The county council of Tipton county grangers held a meeting on the last Friday of April, at which they took pretty high political ground. In substance the resolutions passed provide for a delegate convention of grangers to meet in June and nominate a ticket for county officers, to be composed equally of former democrats and republicans. They fix the salaries of their officers, should they be elected, as follows: Clerk, \$2,000; auditor, \$1,800; treasurer, \$1,600; sheriff, \$1,400. The sheriff is allowed ten cents per mile travelling fees. County commissioners, \$3 per day and twenty cents per mile travelling fees, one trip for each regular session. They will require a bond or obligation from each officer to pay over the fees of his office into the treasury, and they propose to create an executive committee of six to see that these regulations are enforced and to examine the books each quarter and to transact any other business for the welfare of the county. This action of the Council, as will be seen, is a proposal not only for political action as a body, but to govern the county outside and independently of the laws of the state. It need not be said that in this they have overstepped the line, probably not having thoroughly considered the nature of their action.

By the courtesy of the State Auditor, who has granted to the press the use of large portions of his report in advance sheets from time to time, the Sentinel gives this morning a table of great general interest. It shows the rate of taxation in every county of the state as levied by the commissioners, and in another column the total per cent of taxes in each county. The state tax is known to be fifteen cents on the hundred dollars, the school tax is sixteen cents, and the township taxes and special levies for railroad aid, bridges, court houses and local matters, are not given here, though all are shown in detail in the sheets furnished by Mr. Willman. The two columns given are the significant ones, as the first shows what the counties are doing and the great difference in the levies, and the second, or total column, shows the weight of the burden which is crushing the life out of the farmers. In a few cases the showing needs explanation. For instance, Jefferson county stands over \$2.20 on the hundred. One dollar of that is a railroad tax voted, but because of the failure of the project it will not be collected. There is food for thought in the table, and such thought as occupies the minds of most men at this time. There will be an overturning in the system which lies at the basis of this table.

An important decision has just been rendered by Judge Shipley, of Massachusetts, concerning the claims of dentists against the Goodyear Dental Vulcanite company. The decision was in the company's favor, and is a test one for all other similar cases now pending in other states, and of which there are a great number. The history of the whole case is a very interesting one, and briefly told is this: In 1852 Dr. John A. Cummins applied for a patent on a vulcanite rubber in making false teeth, filing his application for a patent in 1855-6 and 1859. It was, however, rejected, and it is asserted that Dr. Cummins then dedicated his discovery to the public, making it common property which could not then be patented. However, he finally obtained a patent in 1864, and this was soon after sold to the Goodyear Dental Vulcanite company. But in the meantime Dr. Cummins' investigation had been freely used by many other dentists, and many suits had grown up under this litigation. At last, as a means of fortification, the dentists nearly all the states formed dentists protective unions agreeing to use the patent and to fight the Goodyear company. In this last suit the best legal talent of the country was employed on both sides. This decision affects the dentists and their customers to the amount of \$200,000 a year in royalties, or in eight years, the life of the patent, it amounts to \$1,600,000.

A grain of mustard seed has fallen by the wayside in Worcester, Mass. Some time ago the Springfield Republican called upon the young men of the state to form political clubs, which forgetting those things which are behind should reach forth unto those things which are before. In other words the design was that the young men should unite upon a plan of action, the object of which, was to disregard old party ties and to purify politics by an infusion of conscience and good sense. In response to this call a large number of the best young men of the city of Worcester met last Saturday evening and proceeded to form such a club. They were from all parties, republicans, democrats, liberals, butlerites, strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes. A platform of principles has been prepared, declaring that the present parties are divided upon issues which are of historical interest only, announcing the object of a club to be the consideration of fresher issues, such as those of centralization, finance, temperance, woman's suffrage, minority representation, the condition of labor and religion as connected with the public schools. It is no part of the plan that these questions should be decided off-hand, but that they should be carefully and thoroughly considered. Of course the club is gushingly patronized by the party press. The republican organ and the democratic organ are delighted with the interest taken by the young men in politics, but suggest that the same ends might more easily be reached within the legitimate party lines. This sort of coaxing probably won't wash. If it does not it will give place to sneers. But if the young men are really in earnest, the one method of persuasion will be as vain as the other, and the seed thus planted in Worcester will spring up all over the country and multiply, and bring forth glorious fruit.

Occasional hints from the organic process indicate that the recent political developments are beginning to make their impression on the party managers. A home organ philosophically remarks that the result in this city will secure better candidates in the republican county convention—yet that same sheet will be loudest in approval of whatever metal the caucus rings may put up. There is among candidates a tacit understanding, too, that the economy dodge supplemented by the one-term notion, will pull the aspiring through. If the people understand themselves, there will be more than mere promises demanded of the successful candidates in the coming contests. To be sure that was not the case in the recent overturn in this city, where the popular indignation and disgust were so great that some of the very outcasts of humanity were swirled into office in the tumult. That, however, will hardly happen again. We shall see our fellow-men exercising some of the functions of citizenship, and the first and greatest of these is the duty of discrimination in the selection of officials. Of one thing the aspirants to office in this state will do well to take notice. There is to be a reduction in the salaries. If the voice of the people means anything, it means this. Not that the people are unwilling to pay a reasonable compensation for service rendered. They will cheerfully recompense their chosen servants for all they are worth. But there is a decided and unanimous revolt against making men rich out of the public treasury for a term or two of service. It is not exactly easy to say what some offices in the counties are worth. For instance, that of county treasurer, besides the lawful fees and perquisites of the place, there is interest and even speculation with the public funds, which makes the treasurers' incomes enormous, anywhere from \$10,000 a year upwards. Only one thing is obvious, that they go in, poor and come out rich, unless, as in some cases, wealth makes them wild and they become "fast" to end in defalcation. The farmers are perfectly right when they claim that a salary of from \$1,500 to \$2,500, will command abilities abundantly competent for auditors, clerks, treasurers, recorders, and sheriffs of the counties. The men who secure these positions are not generally remarkable for talents and education. Their duties require fair capabilities and good education, nothing more. County officers as a general thing possess no qualities to make them deserving of three or four times as much pay as any body else of their fellow-citizens can obtain. There is no reason why a county treasurer should realize \$10,000 a year from his office when he could not by any abilities of his own make a fifth part of that sum in any other way. But there are many and strong reasons why he should not by any means have such pay. In the first place, it is a robbery of the people, a waste of their hard earned money. It is paid out of taxes drawn from the humble homestead of the hard worker and the poor widow. The physician has some show for large fees even from such people, for his skill has cost great sums in time and money. The county officer has no such expensive quality. But the extravagance is not the worst feature. The unjust and unearned pay is demoralizing. It tends to ruin good men. A merchant who has made a fortune on business principles by energy and talent will not be upset by a large income; he turns it into his business and keeps his balance. But take a man who has never made money by honest earning beyond a scanty income, and suddenly expand his resources to a large figure and his wants expand still faster. An officer who can get \$10,000 to \$20,000 out of his place is vastly more likely to make default and involve his securities than he would be on an honest salary of \$2,500. Why grumble about the pay of congressmen and disregard the ridiculous system of county expenses? They are echoed from every state in the union, and every taxpayer in the state. The evil will doubtless receive attention at the June camp meeting, as it is doing in all the counties where the people are uniting against it, regardless of party and name. They have practical work in their eye.

The new compromise currency bill reported from the finance committee on the 8th instant, passed the Senate on Thursday by a vote of 25 to 19. Among those voting for the bill were Messrs. Logan, Oglesby, Ferry (of Michigan) and Allison; among those voting against it were Messrs. Sherman, Thurman, Conkling and Washburn, and among those who paired off were Morton, who would have favored, and Schurz, who would have opposed it. Although this bill was first introduced by Senator Sherman, yet it has suffered so many amendments that he can scarcely recognize it now as his own, at least his vote was cast against it. The bill, as passed, has been amended six times, and every time at the suggestion of Mr. Wright. The first amendment provides that the retirement of legal tender notes shall be in the proportion of 25 per cent, to the issue of new national bank notes, instead of 50 per cent., as originally provided in the bill. The next amendment inserts a clause in the eighth section providing that greenbacks shall be retired in the proportion issued only when \$1,000,000 new national bank notes are issued over and above the maximum amount outstanding at any time. The third amendment makes the interest on the bonds issued to take up United States notes, four and a half per cent, instead of five per cent. The fourth amendment makes these bonds redeemable at the pleasure of the government ten, instead of fifteen, years after the date of issue. The fifth amendment fixes on July 1, 1878, as the date of resumption instead of January 1, 1877, being a year and a half later. The last amendment makes it compulsory on the secretary of the treasury to reissue the United States notes which have been redeemed in coin or gold bonds, this has been made in the purchase of bonds, redemption of the public debt at par in coin, or in payment of government expenses. All these amendments aim at a postponement of specie resumption. But, in addition

to this, the other amendments evidently weaken the policy of an early resumption, the gold bonds with which it is proposed to redeem greenbacks are made to bear a lower rate of interest and run for a shorter time, both of which limitations must diminish their value. Indeed a comparison of the bill, as it now offers itself with its first form explains the dissatisfaction of those who originally drafted and sustained it. Mr. Logan did not hesitate to say that the second and third sections would contract the circulation over \$40,000,000, and other speakers joined in the same opinion. Mr. Sherman says that "the general effect, upon the whole, would be to expand the currency," but he adds that the expansion would take place under "such restrictions and limitations as not to cause depreciation." How to expand a currency without depreciating its value is hardly an open question. The two sections which in Mr. Sherman's opinion would do this are the sixth and eighth, and these authorize the issue of \$164,000,000 of bank notes, and the simultaneous retirement of \$82,000,000 of greenbacks; in other words, they authorize a net inflation to the amount of \$82,000,000, or about 10 1/2 per cent. Besides these changes, the second and third sections in connection with the fifth are of peculiar import. The first releases the banks from all obligation to hold any reserve against their circulation, except five per cent of such circulation, which is to be kept on deposit in the treasury of the United States for the redemption of their notes. The evident effect of this provision would be to induce a considerable expansion if the currency authorized should be called for. The third section, however, requires the banks to hold all their reserves against deposits in their own vaults, and forbids them to reckon balances deposited by them in redemption cities as any part of such reserves. This provision therefore will aid toward contraction, by reducing the amount of loanable funds in the redemption cities. Thus the two provisions would seem to neutralize each other. This latter provision is calculated to destroy at once the equilibrium of the money market by effecting an arbitrary redistribution of loanable funds, an attempt that is ever followed by disaster, as much so as a violation of a natural law. As to the probable action which this bill will receive at the hands of the president, if it should pass the House, it is safe in assuming that he will regard it in the same light as he did the former finance bill, that is as a measure tending to the ruin of the country, and to the repudiation of national faith.

In the Indiana Farmer of this week Mr. J. J. W. Billingsley, gives some facts that deserve careful attention. Mr. Billingsley has been engaged during the past winter in a business which has brought the facts stated to his attention, and enabled him to write with accuracy. The point of his statement is in this passage:

During the past winter we have sold more onions, shipped from Liverpool—grown upon land worth, perhaps, \$500 per acre, shipped three thousand miles by water and a thousand by land—than we have sold of onions grown in our own state. If our own state has consumed 20,000 barrels of onions, at an average of \$500 per barrel, it makes the sum of \$10,000,000. Potatoes we shall probably consume this year 150,000 bushels more than we have grown, at an average of \$2.50 per bushel, making the nice little sum of \$375,000; dried beans and apples, \$500,000; dried corn, \$250,000; canned corn, probably \$250,000; canned small berries and tomatoes, \$100,000; pickles, \$50,000. During this winter a large amount of butter has been shipped to the state from Ohio and Michigan, amounting to thousands of dollars. Our cheese comes principally from other states—also sending us the most—which costs at least \$100,000 annually, and yet we have every facility for making butter and cheese. Nursery stock, and trees bought from nursery sales, frequently not reliable, say \$50,000 more.

Altogether the writer estimates that a round half million has left the state for food products, which can be raised in Indiana as easily as anywhere else in the world. There is no lack of soil and should be no want of labor when so many people are asking every day for employment, even in positions which offer but small compensation. To the facts presented of similar ones, some localities might offer explanatory answers. The Southern farmers buy corn and meat grown in the North to feed their families because they can make more money by raising cotton. At least, they think so, and in many cases it is true, though the policy is admitted to be bad. It is not assumed that Indiana does not produce food sufficient to support her population. She does, and in addition a large surplus for exportation. She sells corn, wheat, pork and some beef. The money received for these is paid out for the lighter articles named, and some of it, as appears to be the reproach of the United States, goes to England for onions. There are two aspects of the case. In the first place, it can be very readily shown that the articles bought by Indiana are the most profitable of all crops to raise. It is no fact that in the eastern states \$500 net profit has been realized from a single acre of onions. All the articles named are more profitable than corn, wheat or hogs, especially for small farmers. But this question is not the more important. It does not matter that our farmers run to the great staples. The main point is that there are idle lands and idle hands enough in the state to have produced all the half million dollars worth of food named, and thus kept the money at home, selling just as much of the leading products as we have. Take the agents, commission brokers, speculators, the unsuccessful ones only, idle sons of rich farmers, city loafers, chronic office seekers, and all the drones of society who are the real cause of public poverty and hard times, and they could have kept this half million in the state and some of it from leaving the American shores. But suppose the class named won't work—and they certainly won't if they can avoid it—those who do would find it to their advantage to meet the demands of home consumption in vegetables and dairy products. There is certainly something to be learned in the manner of directing farm industry that will be not only of individual advantage, but a great benefit to Indiana as a state.

Concerning a sewing machine "trick." While the farmers are casting out "middle men" and the people in general are crying aloud against monopolies of all sorts, a brief glance at one ingenious species of extortion may prove not only interesting, but useful. It is a story of a sewing machine, and it may be stated as a general and preliminary truth that there is no more prolific source swindling the American public than this same thrifty mechanism. Look now, an inventive Chicagoan devised what is known among men, and women, too, and for that matter women most, as the fast attachment. He got it patented. In the meantime "rings" of sewing machine manufacturers, disregarding this previous patent, applied for the same patent and were unsuccessful. They continued however to use it, in spite of their defeat since they could do so with impunity, the original patentee being very poor and unable to sustain any more continuous suits. He however sold portions of his patent and these had been gradually bought up by the Wilson Sewing Machine Company, and they finally obtained a new patent for an extended term. At last, after fourteen years of struggle, the original patentee found himself without a patent, or any income from it, while his adversaries were annually reaping large sums in the way of royalties for every machine made in the country. Some years ago congress again extended this profitable trade to those of the eye and ear treatment. The records of ophthalmic hospitals and blind asylums throughout the country show hundreds of cases of persons who have become partly or totally blind through such quackery and now it is again importuned to still further sanction this monopoly. A correspondent writing to the New York Tribune on this subject, says:

By means of this swindle of extended patents, contrary to law and decency, the people of this country are compelled to pay more than \$10,000,000 per annum more than would be paid if the combination could not carry this swindle through congress. About four years ago, the way by which this swindle became known to the writer. One hundred thousand dollars was placed at the control of a man who went to Washington and secured the money, as the Credit Mobilier stock was put, where it would do the most good, accomplished the object, and the patent was extended.

Thus it is seen that there is perhaps, no greater legalized swindle in this country today, than the sewing machine monopoly. Then it is remembered that the original patent for the principle sewing machine is free; that the proprietors of six or eight different machines have combined their resources to permit no manufacturer to use the "Wilson feed," and that the actual cost of a sewing machine of any design does not exceed \$11 each, it will be seen to what an enormous degree of robbery this business is carried on. Indeed, it is a fact that any machine now sold for less than \$100 in this country could be profitably sold for from twenty-five to thirty-five dollars; in fact, the same machines which sell here for from fifty to ninety dollars have been exported and profitably sold in England at from twenty-five to thirty-five dollars. Of course these exorbitant prices are sustained to some extent by the presence of numerous agents and middle-men, but there is no good reason to-day why the people of this country should practically pay \$6,000,000 as a royalty on this "Wilson feed" improvement. It is a fraud, but if it succeeds before congress again it will not be the first monopoly which has been granted by that virtuous and highly disinterested body of public servants.

It will be remembered how base, and vile and scandalous the Sentinel was said to be for publishing the call of a body of farmers for a convention, and how the organ, day in and day out for weeks, heaped coals of fire on its head as a "fraud" and a "trick" and everything false, and how it couldn't find, even in its copious vocabulary of billingsgate terms descriptive of the Sentinel's business, You can't have forgotten all this for it was but yesterday as it were. But things have come to pass since those days of doubt and disgust. The same type which had often told the atrocity of the Sentinel's fraud, meekly formed itself into this amazing concession. Said the Journal:

Judging from present indications it is not probable that the "Farmers' Convention," to be held in this city on the 16th of June, will be largely attended. There is a good reason for this. The sentimentality of the state, and the enthusiasm resulting from the successful organization of the grand movement, have been unusually prompt to embrace every suggestion that looks to the betterment of their condition, and to the movement of the farmers' cause. They are of course anxious for a new deal, and not a few honest republicans seem disposed to think the old party needs chastening. As many minds change as a change of wind, and many meaning persons are always ready to join in any new movement that promises reform, and which may be expected to result in the reform to be reached or where the movement will end. Under these circumstances we shall not be surprised if the convention called for the 16th prox. is quite largely attended. Nobody questions the right of the farmers thus to organize and to nominate and elect a ticket if they choose, but it seems to us they might well hesitate before deciding on that course. The moment they put in the field a ticket they destroy the usefulness of the grange movement in this state. The true policy of the patrons of husbandry, as we have often declared, is to control the politics of the country through existing parties. Let democratic grangers control the democratic conventions, and compel the nomination of moderate, temperate men, and let the republicans do the same in the republican conventions. By so doing they can thoroughly control the country politics and secure all the objects of their organization. And they can not do any other way. Suppose they nominate a state ticket on the 16th of June. They can not hope to elect it unless it is endorsed and supported as a whole by either the republicans or the democratic party, and there is little probability that it would be endorsed by either party. Neither republicans nor democrats intend to abandon their party organizations in this state. Some may, but the great majority will not. Both parties will doubtless nominate tickets, and if the farmers throw the state into the hands of the democracy, as the originators of the movement intended, and what would be the result? It would be the election of a ticket which would lead in the way of reform from the democratic party. That once in power and the grange movement will, indeed, be a disastrous end.

Do you see the point? Oliver has been making inquiries. He has been hearing everything that "dressed" the other day and Oliver says "sweeten the farmers and the low for young ducks." Charming elasticity of the organ, isn't it? How convenient and altogether lovely it is to be relieved of the disagreeable necessity of thinking. The organ pipes to-day. Oliver changes his mind and it pipes yes and you get your money's worth. Now observe how the country sheets will echo the central organ's sentiment!

## ARKANSAS PACIFIED.

CALL UP WITH BROOKS.

WILLIAMS' OPINION.

A LEGAL REVIEW—HE DECLARES BAXTER THE LAWFUL EXECUTIVE—THE GROUND FOR BROOKS' CLAIM.

WASHINGTON, May 15.—The attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each claiming to be governor of the state, had applied to the president for aid to suppress insurrection. After quoting from the constitution of Arkansas a section providing for the opening and publishing of returns of elections for state officers, under which Baxter was declared governor and the clause providing for contested elections, under which Brooks was declared governor, the attorney general states that the attorney general has submitted to the president his opinion in the Arkansas case, wherein Eliza Baxter and Joseph Brooks, each